

Application Serial No.: 09/668,291  
Response to Advisory Action dated February 3, 2004 &  
Supplemental to Office Action dated October 7, 2003

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 20-26 are presently active in this case, Claims 1 and 20 having been amended by way of the present Amendment.

Claims 1-6 and 20-26 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loubinoux et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,294,036) in view of Angell, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,037,284) and Kuts (U.S. Patent No. 2,954,815).

The Advisory Action indicates that the Angell, Jr. et al. reference is relied upon for the teaching of the heated rollers recited in Claims 1 and 20 of the present application. The Advisory Action further indicates that the rollers being relied upon in the Angell, Jr. et al. reference are exposed to the heat used to maintain the tow in the molten condition. The Angell, Jr. et al. reference describes at column 4, lines 42-48, that "[t]he resin portion of the impregnated tow is maintained in a molten condition while passing through the kneader rolls (23) and compression rolls (24) by applying external heating, such as by use of radiant heaters or heated air. The coating area may also be enclosed as a further air to maintaining an elevated temperature environment." The Angell, Jr. et al. reference refers specifically to external heating of the resin portion of the impregnation tow. The Angell, Jr. et al. reference does not teach or suggest a rotating impregnation device including heated rollers having heating elements therein, as recited in Claims 1 and 20. (See, e.g., page 8, lines 17-23, and

page 11, lines 30-36, for support for the amendments set forth herein.)

The Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established in the present case based upon the presently cited reference, because the references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. (See MPEP 2143.) More specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest a process for manufacturing a composite tape characterized in that the sheet is made to pass through a rotating impregnation device including heated rollers having heating elements therein, as recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, the cited references do not teach or suggest a process for manufacturing a composite tape comprising the step of passing the sheet through a rotating impregnation device including heated rollers having heating elements therein, as recited in Claim 20. Accordingly, the Applicants request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

Claims 2-6 are considered allowable for the reasons advanced for Claim 1 from which they depend. These claims are further considered allowable as they recite other features of the invention that are neither disclosed, taught, nor suggested by the applied references when those features are considered within the context of Claim 1.

Claims 21-26 are considered allowable for the reasons advanced for Claim 20 from which they depend. These claims are further considered allowable as they recite other features of the invention that are neither disclosed, taught, nor suggested by the applied references when those features are considered within the context of Claim 20.

Application Serial No.: 09/668,291  
Response to Advisory Action dated February 3, 2004 &  
Supplemental to Office Action dated October 7, 2003

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Attorney of Record

Christopher D. Ward  
Registration No. 41,367

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel. (703) 413-3000  
Fax. (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 10/01)

GJM:CDW:brf  
I:\atty\cdw\1247\1247 0849\am5.doc